

Serial No. 09/901,746

July 22, 2003

Reply to the Office Action dated February 25, 2003

Page 7 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 1-4, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 16-18.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 14 to correct the minor informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mandai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,227,739). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-21.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"A resonator comprising:

a multi-layer substrate having an upper and lower surface and including at least two conductor layers which include at least two grounding conductor layers and a plurality of dielectric layers, one of the at least two grounding conductor layers being disposed on the lower surface of the multi-layer substrate;

a strip line disposed between the at least two grounding conductor layers;

a microstrip line disposed on the upper surface of said multi-layer substrate; and

a through hole formed in said dielectric layers to connect said strip line to said microstrip line; wherein

portions of the one of the at least two conductor layers that is closest to said microstrip line are omitted; and

one omitted portion is aligned with the through hole and another omitted portion is aligned with the microstrip line." (emphasis added)

Applicant's claim 1 recites the feature of "one omitted portion is aligned with the through hole and another omitted portion is aligned with the microstrip line." Applicant's claims 8 and 14 recite features which are similar to the features recited in Applicant's claim 1, including the above emphasized features. With the improved features of claims

Serial No. 09/901,746

July 22, 2003

Reply to the Office Action dated February 25, 2003

Page 8 of 9

1, 8 and 14, Applicant has been able to provide a resonator that minimizes degradation of the Q factor, accurately adjusts the frequency, and has a greatly reduced size and profile thereof (see, for example, the second full paragraph on page 3 of the Specification).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the features of "one omitted portion is aligned with the through hole and another omitted portion is aligned with the microstrip line" and has amended claims 8 and 14 to recite similar features.

Mandai et al. clearly does not teach or suggest the feature of "one omitted portion is aligned with the through hole and another omitted portion is aligned with the microstrip line" as recited in Applicant's claim 1 and similarly in claims 8 and 14. In contrast, Mandai et al. teaches omitted portion V1 that is aligned with the through hole connecting the "microstrip" line 9 and the strip line 4. Mandai et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest another of the omitted portions of the conductor layer 7 that is aligned with the "microstrip" line 9.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mandai et al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 1, 8, and 14 of the present application. Claims 2-7 depend upon claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 9-13 depend upon claim 8 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 8 is allowable. Claims 15-21 depend upon claim 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 14 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a TWO-month

Serial No. 09/901,746
July 22, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated February 25, 2003
Page 9 of 9

extension of time, extending to July 25, 2003, the period for response to the Office
Action dated February 25, 2003.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in
connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit
Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 22, 2003


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 22 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800